

## **Remarks**

### **1. Summary of Office Action**

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5, 12, and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,194,354 (Oran). The Examiner rejected claims 3-4, 6-11, 13-17, 25, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oran in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0063714 (Stumer). Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oran in view of Stumer, and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0024943 (Karaul), and the Examiner rejected claims 20, 24, and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oran in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0007999 (Becker). The Examiner also rejected claims 21 and 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oran in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0057425 (Brouwer), and the Examiner rejected claims 22 and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oran in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0160363 (Powers). In addition, the Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oran in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0190497 (Knox).

The Examiner objected to claim 26-28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that claims 26-28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Finally, the Examiner allowed claims 41-69.

## **2. Status of the Claims**

Currently pending are claims 26-28 and 41-69, of which claims 26-28, 41, and 50 are independent, and the remainder are dependent. Applicants have cancelled claims 1-25 and 29-40.

Applicants have amended each of claims 26-28 so as to cast them in independent form, each claim now including all of the limitations of the (now-cancelled) base claim and any intervening claims. Specifically, as amended, claim 26 now incorporates all of the limitations of (now-cancelled) claims 1, 24, and 25. Similarly, claim 27 also now incorporates all of the limitations of (now-cancelled) claims 1, 24, and 25. Claim 28 now incorporates all of the limitations of (now-cancelled) claims 1 and 24.

## **3. Response to Objections to Claims**

The Examiner objected to claim 26-28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that claims 26-28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. With the amendments to claims 26-28 noted above, Applicants have rewritten each of these claims in the manner suggested by the Examiner, and therefore submit that claims 26-28 are now allowable.

## **4. Allowed Claims**

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 41-69.

## **5. Response to Rejections**

As noted, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-25 and 29-40. Therefore the rejections of these claims under one or another of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a) are now moot.

## 6. Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, and without conceding any of the Examiner's assertions not addressed herein, Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance and respectfully requests the Examiner to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned patent agent, at 312-913-3353.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: April 23, 2008

By: /David A. Grabelsky/  
David A. Grabelsky  
Reg. No. 59,208